

Appl. No. 10/772842  
Reply to Action dated 7/21/2006  
Page 2

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 23 2006

### REMARKS

Claims 7-9, 14, and 16 are currently under examination. All other pending claims are withdrawn. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested.

Claim 7 appears to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. and Yamaguchi et al.

Claim 7 is directed to a light-emitting device which includes a luminescent layer and an electrode structure. A shielding layer in a shape substantially corresponding to a pattern of interference fringes of a hologram is provided at an abutting position outside of the luminescent layer, "and the shielding layer and the luminescent layer are a unitary structure". That is, the shielding layer abutting the luminescent layer becomes part of the unitary structure with the luminescent layer.

Wu discloses an optical package for eliminating tilt angle between a header and an optical emitter. Optical emitter 26 is disposed on header 28. A can lid 30 is spaced to the sides of and the above optical emitter 26. A glass member 34 with a holographic element 32 thereon is held by can lid 30 above optical emitter 26. The disclosure of Wu is directed to eliminating a tilt angle between the optical emitter and the header, the two of which are spaced apart.

The emitting device of Wu having a spaced apart can lid holding a holographic element does not disclose such unitary structure.

Yamaguchi discloses an optical recording and reproducing apparatus and method that includes an emitting receiving unit 6 having a semiconductor laser 6a, a photodetector 6b and a hologram plate 6c (Figures 3 and 5A). In Yamaguchi, the hologram plate 6c is spaced from the semiconductor laser 6a by the distance L as shown in Figure 5A. Therefore, the hologram plate 6c and the semiconductor laser 6a appear to be separated from one another, similar to Wu, and are not abutting as a unitary structure.

The configuration of the receiving unit 6 in Yamaguchi is not clear from the Yamaguchi disclosure. It is possible from Figures 3 and 5A of Yamaguchi that there is an air gap (having the distance L) between the semiconductor laser 6a and the hologram plate 6c. Column 8, lines 31-35 of Yamaguchi mentions that the hologram plate 6c is integrated with the laser 6a. However, the meaning of integrated as used by Yamaguchi

Appl. No. 10/772842  
Reply to Action dated 7/21/2006  
Page 3

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 23 2006

is not clear. The hologram plate 6c could be separated from the laser 6a with an air gap therebetween in a configuration similar to Wu and yet the plate 6c could still be considered integrated with the laser 6a.

There is no teaching in Yamaguchi that the hologram plate 6c and the semiconductor laser 6a are abutting as a unitary structure.

Claims 8, 9, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being obvious on consideration of Wu and Yamaguchi, in view of Kozlov et al.

Kozlov does not teach or point to that which Wu and Yamaguchi do not disclose. Claims 8, 9, 14 and 16 are non-obvious and patentable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition of allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination is requested. Allowance of claims 7-9, 14 and 16 at an early date is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

Dated: October 23, 2006

By: Curtis B. Hamre  
Curtis B. Hamre  
Reg. No. 29,165  
CBH/jal